cf 1601 (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 2490 /2004

PETITIONER

Chain Janghel, aged about 37 years, son of Shri Rikhidas Janghel, resident of – Sector 5, Bhilai, Distt. Durg (Chhattisgarh)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of 'Chhattisgarh through: the Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, (C.G).

2. The Chhattisgarh Board of Ayurvedic and Unani System of Medicine and Naturopathy, Raipur, through : Its Registrar, Raipur (C.G.)

3. The State of Madhya Pradesh, through : Its Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, Mantralay, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

4. The Madhya Pradesh Board of Ayurvedic and Unani System of Medicine and Naturopathy, Madhya Pradesh, through : The Registrar, Shyamla Hills, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)

P. R. No. 2487/04
Presented by Shri P. P. Sahu
dated 10-8-04

RECEIVED-COPY
10/8/04
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

May this please to your Lordship.

XI-HC-22

(30)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 2470/04 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

10.9.2004

Shri P.P. Sahu, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri N.K. Agrawal, Dy. Advocate General for the State.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner has challenged in this petition that respondent No.2 is not supplying him enrolment form for the purpose of applying for registration as Ayurvedic Practitioner. The petitioner had acquired qualification in Vaidya Visharad from Hindi Sahitya Sammelan Prayag, Allahabad, which was recognized under Adhiniyam 1970, but by notification-dated 4.11.89 said recognition was withdrawn w.e.f. 4.11.89.

The claim of the petitioner is that he obtained the degree before 04.11.1989, since then he is practicing, therefore, when he started practice, the degree was recognized. The further claim of the petitioner is that in the light of the order of M.P. High Court passed in Writ Petition No. 287/90 between Shekhar Jain Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & others (Annexure P-1), the respondent ought to have supplied the form and consider the case of the petitioner.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, respondent No. 2 is directed to supply the form to the petitioner and thereafter decide the case of the petitioner about the eligibility of the registration in the light of the order passed by M.P. High Court in W.P. No.287/90 between Shekhar Jain Vs State of Madhya Pradesh & others.

With aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.W.P. No.2205/04 & I.A. No.5589/04 also stand disposed of.

Certified copy as per Rules.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

[पीछे देखिये